

Appl. No. 10/805,755
Amdt. Dated 11/30/2006
Reply to Office Action of September 20, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 29 2006

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed September 20, 2006. In the Office Action, claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 5-17 are withdrawn from consideration and have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1-3 has been amended, claim 4 has been cancelled without prejudice and claims 18-33 have been added. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Takahashi (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0141739). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because a *prima facie* case of anticipation can not be established based on the amendment presented above.

As the Examiner is aware, to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Vergegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

For instance, with respect to claim 1, Takahashi fails to describe each and every limitation set forth in the claim such as the following:

a first processor coupled to the communication bus, *the first processor to decode a first stream data routed over the communication bus;*

a second processor provided with *a second stream data received from the drive device without being routed over the communication bus*, the second processor to decode the second stream data to reproduce the second stream data in accordance with an instruction sent from the first processor over the communication bus. *Emphasis added*

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the §102(e) rejection of claims 1-3 and to consider the allowability of newly added claims 18-33.

Appl. No. 10/805,755
Amtd. Dated 11/30/2006
Reply to Office Action of September 20, 2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
NOV 29 2006

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: November 29, 2006

By


William W. Schaal

Reg. No. 39,018

Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

MAILING

FACSIMILE

☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service
as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

☒ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and
Trademark Office.

Date: 11/29/2006


Susan McFarlane

11/29/2006

Date